

**REMARKS**

**INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS**

In the Office Action, at page 2, the drawings were objected to. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the control methods recited in claims 4, 10 and 12 not shown in the drawings.

Regarding claim 4, the control method is shown in Fig. 4.

Regarding claim 10, the control method is shown in Fig. 4.

Regarding claim 12, the control method is shown in Fig. 3.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections to the drawings are respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 1-11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Kikuyama (US 6,182,455 B1) (hereinafter "Kikuyama"). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Kikuyama discloses an apparatus for controlling a cooling unit where the controller controls a compressor provided in the cooling unit and at least one of the first and second DC motors to sequentially start with a predetermined interval. Kikuyama, col. 2, lines 33-35. The problem Kikuyama tries to overcome is the large starting current necessary to simultaneously start a condenser fan motor and the evaporator fan motors. Kikuyama, col. 2, lines 1-8. The admitted prior art discloses that the control of the freezer and refrigeration fans and the compressor in response to compartment temperature is conventional.

Independent claim 1 recites: "...turning a part of the at least two air blast devices in the starting condition and the compressor on...." Independent claim 6 recites: "...turning the compressor and the refrigerating chamber air blast device on...." Independent claim 13 recites:

“...turning a part of the at least two air blast devices in the starting condition and the compressor on....” Independent claim 14 recites: “...turning the compressor and the refrigerating chamber air blast device on....” Regarding independent claims 1, 6, 13 and 14, each of these claims recite turning on an air blast device and the compressor. The Examiner cites Kikuyama for teaching providing a time delay between the operation of the compressor and multiple evaporator fans in order to reduce the load on the system and reduce power surge. Claims 1, 6, 13 and 14 recite turning on one of the air blast devices and the compressor. Kikuyama specifically teaches away from starting blast units and the compressor together. Neither Kikuyama nor the admitted prior art teach or suggest starting the compressor and one of the blast air devices on and then providing a time delay for the starting of remaining air blast devices. Therefore, the combination of Kikuyama and the admitted prior art fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2-5 and 7-11, these claims are dependent on one of either independent claims 1 or 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons noted above. Claims 2-5 and 7-11 also recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. For example, claim 7 recites the compressor in the starting condition, in case that the refrigerating chamber has a temperature higher than a first reference temperature or the freezing chamber has a temperature higher than a second reference temperature.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

## **OBJECTION TO CLAIM 12**

At page 3 of the Office Action, claim 12 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, withdrawal of the objection of claim 12 is respectfully requested at least due to its dependency upon claim 6, for the reasons mentioned above.

**CONCLUSION**

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of the Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 24, 2005

By:   
Gene M. Garner, II  
Registration No. 34,172

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501